

March 7, 2023

Dear Honorable Committee Members:

I am deeply concerned about the numerous gun control bills that have been introduced into the House and Senate. These bills infringe upon my Constitutional Second Amendment Rights as a law-abiding American and Michigan citizen. I am a responsible gun owner; I've taken all the required NRA classes to obtain my CPL. I fully understand firearm safety. Responsible gun owners know this information and typically spend many hours at a range--many times with an instructor--to ensure they stay on top of gun safety and how to properly use a firearm.

Unfortunately, these bills do nothing to protect law-abiding citizens. They DO strip away our rights to defend ourselves against the criminal(s) who will ALWAYS be able to illegally procure a firearm.

Here are facts to consider:

- **The purpose of the 2nd Amendment is self-defense.** If the goal of the state government is to enhance the safety of its citizens, firearm ownership and carry should be encouraged, not discouraged. According to the Manhattan Institute and research by John Lott, since the 1990's, studies have shown that armed, law-abiding citizens can promote a safer society, reducing murders by nearly 8% and reducing violent crime like rape in general about 5%.
- As written, these safe storage laws (HB 4144) present risks to citizens in self-defense situations. Speed/Ease of access is one of the most important factors in critical defense situations. Home intruders will not wait for a person to retrieve ammunition and a weapon from separate locations and give them time to load the weapon before attacking them. Education on firearm safety is far more effective and does not endanger or restrict responsible, law-abiding citizens in self-defense situations.
- The 2nd Amendment states, "The right of the people to keep and bear arms **shall not be infringed.**" Notably, judgements by SCOTUS have clarified the meaning of this phrase in these ways:
 - **Heller:** Protects individual ownership of common use firearms.
 - **McDonald:** Shows that the Bill of Rights is binding on state governments (State law must be in keeping with the 2nd Amendment)
 - **Bruen:** Set a standard of strict scrutiny based on text and historic tradition. This means that any time the government wishes to regulate firearms, it must show that the text is standard and consistent with lawful practice at the historic time of the passage of the 2nd Amendment in 1791. "To justify its regulation of firearms under the Second Amendment, the government may not simply posit that the regulation promotes an important interest; rather, **the government must demonstrate that the regulation is consistent with the nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation.**" **ALL of the proposed regulations fail this test.**
 - **Bruen:** The court's ruling here also states that government cannot "haphazardly" define places as sensitive locations in order to ban Concealed Carry
- Extreme Risk Protection Orders (HB 1445, 1446)- As written, these can violate the 14th Amendment Due Process Clause

- Extreme Risk Protection Orders (HB 1445, 1446)- require a person to prove their innocence that than requiring the government to prove someone's guilt before their rights are violated
- Accused criminals enjoy more rights under the 4th, 5th, and 14th amendments than a than a lawful gun owner enjoying their 2nd amendment rights under the proposed HB 1445, 1446
- Extreme Risk Protection Order thresholds are too low, when things like simply purchasing ammunition serve as a threshold for showing that a person is a risk
- Concealed Carry (HB 4127): Does not meet the standard of Bruen; prohibits citizens from carrying a firearm within 100 feet of a polling place/ballot drop box for as much as 40 days before an election. Because of dropboxes near roads, this could stop law abiding concealed carry citizens from using many common roads and sidewalks or going to common locations (In Eaton County, how many churches and public gathering places are used as polling places?)
- Concealed Carry (HB 4150): Prevents concealed carry in most grocery stores, gas stations, restaurants, rest areas, and other common places
- There are more than 800,000 law-abiding citizens in Michigan who have concealed carry licenses, including women who have been victims of rape, stalking, and other crimes. By severely restricting their ability to carry and defend themselves and deter attackers, these individuals will be even more at risk of suffering repeated violence
- These laws do nothing to prevent mass shootings or ensure the good laws we already hav are actually enforced: they simply increase gun free zones to such an extent that second amendment rights are all but null in void in Michigan. Because these laws are inconsistent with the standards of the Supreme Court, they will result in costly legal battles and waste taxpayer money will infringing on the basic right of self defense.

My question is simple: If these bills pass and are signed into law, which of you will take responsibility for the deaths of innocent citizens by criminals who will still have the means to illegally procure a firearm—citizens who are no longer able to defend themselves because their Second Amendment rights have been stripped away? Are you willing to accept that responsibility? Because I suspect the family of the victim(s) will hold you responsible.

Thank you for considering my concerns, and thank you for your service.

Respectfully,

Libby Ranshaw